{In Archive} RE: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support for Huntley Steam Station , NY

Meadows, Kelly to: Jamie Piziali 11/02/2011 06:16 PM
"Chuck Nieder (wcnieder@gw.dec.state.ny.us)" ,
Cc: "mjcalaba@gw.dec.state.ny.us" , Karen OBrien, "Sunda, John", "Geil, Steven"

History: This message has been forwarded.

Archive: This message is being viewed in an archive.

1 attachment

Huntley Follow-up Responses 110211.docx

Hello--

Please see attached for responses to the questions below. Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Thanks
Kelly

-----Original Message-----
From: Piziali.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Piziali.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 01, 2011 1:45 PM
To: Meadows, Kelly
Subject: Fw: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support for Huntley Steam Station, NY

Kelly -

Can you please clarify the questions below regarding the Huntley Tetra
Tech technical review from 10/05/2011?

Thank you,

Jamie Piziali
(formerly Jamie Hurley)
US EPA - Water Permits Division
Phone: 202-564-1709
Fax: 202-564-6431

----- Forwarded by Jamie Piziali/DC/USEPA/US on 11/01/2011 01:41 PM -----

From: "Chuck Nieder" <wcnieder@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
To: Jamie Piziali/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Karen OBrien/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Mike Calaban" <mjcalaba@gw.dec.state.ny.us>

Date: 11/01/2011 01:33 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support for Huntley Steam Station, NY

Jamie - the review provided to us by Tetra Tech is fairly straight forward and we see no need to hold a conference call. However, we have 3 points we would like clarified:

1. It appears that the difference between NRG's claim of a 91.2% reduction in cooling water use and Tetra Tech's analysis showing an 84.5% reduction is due to NRG not including the 20,000 gpm of service water used. Does this volume account for NRG's statement of recirculating and cooling approximately 93% of the water passing through the two condensers?
2. Under Conclusions (No.2), please explain the advantage of isolating the service water screens and pumps at the intake so that the pumps continue to withdraw from the river.
3. Again Under Conclusions, No 7. asks whether operating in the once through mode should remain an option if closed cycle cooling is selected as BTA. Does the term "once through mode" in this question refer to the open configuration of the proposed intake and discharge basins, and that by not being closed off, mixing of cooling tower return water and river water can occur?

It does not matter to us how these points get clarified - a written response would be adequate. If Tetra Tech would prefer to discuss this via a conference call, that is fine with us but not necessary. If further clarifications are needed, Tetra Tech can email or call Mike Calaban (518-402-8857).

Thanks again for all your assistance.

Chuck

Chuck Nieder
Steam Electric Unit Leader
NYSDEC
Bureau of Habitat, 5th Floor
625 Broadway

Albany NY 12233-4756
518-402-9216 (phone)
518-402-8925 (fax)
wcnieder@gw.dec.state.ny.us
>>> <Piziali.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov> 10/28/2011 1:59 PM >>>

Chuck -

Are you all interested in having a follow-up call on these materials?

I am about to go on a temporary 6 month detail here to work in Solid
Waste starting November 7, so my availability will be a little more
sparse, but at this point I intend to continue to manage the contract
and answer emergency Clean Water Act Section 316 questions because there
is not a great back up here for me. My e-mail remains the same, but
my phone may change for a while because I am switching buildings to our
office in Northern VA (right outside DC).

Furthermore, Is there additional work you all will be interested in
before December 31? or After January 1? My current Work Assignment
will be up on December 31, and I am debating over what to write in the
new one, or whether to put it on hold until I return next May.

Thanks!

Jamie Piziali
(formerly Jamie Hurley)
US EPA - Water Permits Division
Phone: 202-564-1709
Fax: 202-564-6431

----- Forwarded by Jamie Piziali/DC/USEPA/US on 10/28/2011 01:50 PM -----

From:"Meadows, Kelly" <Kelly.Meadows@tetratech.com>
To:Jamie Piziali/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date:10/05/2011 04:44 PM
Subject:FW: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support
for Huntley Steam Station, NY

-----Original Message-----
From: Meadows, Kelly

Sent: Wednesday, October 05, 2011 4:06 PM
To: 'Hurley.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov'
Cc: 'wcnieder@gw.dec.state.ny.us'; Sunda, John; Steven Geil
Subject: RE: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support for
Huntley Steam Station, NY

Hello--

Please see attached for our assessment of the feasibility of
closed-cycle cooling at Huntley. The attached memo addresses items 1 and
2 below. We have also compiled some thoughts on item 3, but have not
developed them into a formal deliverable (as was discussed in the
kickoff call). But we would be happy to share these with you in a follow
up call, email or whatever format makes the most sense.

Please let us know if you have any questions--we're available to discuss
these findings in more detail.

Thanks
Kelly

-----Original Message-----
From: Hurley.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Hurley.Jamie@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2011 4:38 PM
To: Meadows, Kelly
Subject: TD: 090111: WA 0-28,Task 2 - 316 Technical Permit Support for
Huntley Steam Station, NY

Kelly -

Please provide technical assistance according to Task 2 for New York's
Huntley Steam Station permit.

New York is interested in a technical review of the documents and other
information used by the Department to make a BTA determination the
Huntley Steam Station as it relates to the feasibility of retrofitting
this facility with a closed-cycle cooling system; and (2) a professional
opinion as to the availability of a closed-cycle cooling retrofit for
the Huntley Steam Station to meet the BTA requirements of CWS Section
316(b).

New York is particularly interested in the following issues:

1. A professional opinion as to whether or not retrofitting the Huntley Steam Station with a closed-cycle cooling system is feasible and available based on the information and claims provided to New York State by NRG along with technical documents and information used by New York State in making a BTA determination;
2. Identification and discussion of additional data and/or information that will be required to evaluate impacts associated with the installation and operation of closed-cycle cooling at this facility; and
3. A professional opinion as to the technical accuracy of the Department's provisional BTA determination taking into consideration the following factors: engineering and technical feasibility, entrainment impacts on the waterbody, quantified and qualified social benefits and social costs including ecological benefits; impacts on air resources, impacts on the reliability of energy delivery in the immediate area; remaining useful plant life; and the impacts of the BTA determination on water consumption.

Please also see the more detailed information regarding Huntley Steam Station below and please let me know if you need any additional information.

The materials for review will be provided separately from this e-mail.

(See attached file: Scope of Services Huntley May 2011_.docx)

Jamie Hurley
US EPA - Water Permits Division
Phone: 202-564-1709
Fax: 202-564-6431

[attachment "Huntley Tetra Tech technical review 100511.docx" deleted by Jamie Piziali/DC/USEPA/US]